

Response: 10/622,286

Docket: 42P14058

**Remarks**

The referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the referenced Office Action.

In the Claims, claims 1-25 are pending in the referenced application.

Claims 5, 16 and 22 are amended to clarify Applicant's claimed invention.

Claims 1-25 are rejected. The rejections are now traversed.

Claims 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically the Action asserts that the claims are directed to a machine readable medium. However, this assertion is incorrect because claims 12-15 are directed to a processor based server, while original claims 16-25 are directed to a machine readable medium. For expediency, Applicant assumes that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 are restricted to claims 16-25 only.

As amended claims 16 and claim 22 respectively are now directed to a tangible machine readable medium. Therefore all claims dependent on claim 16 and 22 respectively viz. claims 17-21, and 23-25 are also directed to a tangible machine readable medium. Thus, the rejections of claims 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter are moot and should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 5 is amended, and the rejection is moot in light of the amendment and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 and 11-21 are rejected as anticipated by Cook, et al., US Patent No. 6,922,776 (Cook).

Response: 10/622,286

Docket: 42P14058

Claim 1 recites, in pertinent part, an element directed to registering a first party as a party relying upon a second party's certificate. The Action asserts that this element of the claim is disclosed by Cook at col. 6, lines 38-44. The cited text in Cook however, refers only to the upload of a certificate. Nowhere in Cook is a connection made between this upload and any registration of the user or a first party as relying upon a certificate. Cook in fact does not fairly disclose nor suggest the element of claim 1 directed to registering a first party as a party relying upon a second party's certificate. Therefore for at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Cook cannot stand. Similarly claims 11 and 16 each of which incorporates the same element as claim 1 discussed above cannot be anticipated by Cook and the rejections of these claims cannot stand for at least this reason. Thus the rejections of claims 2-6, and 17-21 which depend on claims 1 and 16 respectively also cannot stand for at least this reason.

Claims 7-10 and 22-25 are rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC 103a) over Cook in view of Kaliski, Jr. US Patent No. 6,085,320.

The rejections of these claims however rely on Cook for the element related to registering a first party as a party relying upon a second party's certificate which is present in each of the claims 7-10 and 22-25. As discussed above, this element of the claims is neither disclosed nor suggested by Cook and therefore the rejection of claims 7-10 and 22-25 as unpatentable over Cook in view of Kaliski cannot stand and should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

Therefore, the rejections of all claims pending in the application should be withdrawn and all claims allowed.

Response: 10/622,286

Docket: 42P14058

The Examiner is welcome to contact the Attorney of Record,  
Sanjay S. Gadkari at 503-264-4348 to discuss any matters in connection  
with the case. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees  
in connection with this communication to our Deposit Account No. 02-  
2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
LLP

Date: March 7, 2007

/Sanjay S. Gadkari/

Sanjay S. Gadkari  
Reg. No. 55,796

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(503) 439-8778